



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.          | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|--|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/804,415   | 03/19/2004  | Chung-Ren Wang       | 250908-1220                  | 7263                   |
| 24504 7590 01/08/2008<br>THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP<br>600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, S.E.<br>STE 1500<br>ATLANTA, GA 30339-5994 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>TURCHEN, JAMES R |                        |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2139             | PAPER NUMBER           |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>01/08/2008      | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/804,415

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

James Turchen

Art Unit

2139

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-20 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 10/25/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the argument to claim 1:

Examiner disagrees with applicant's assertion that the PBDM reference does not disclose the receiving and determining processes. It is inherent in PBDM that the receiving a delegation condition takes place along with a delegation approval. The act of John sending the delegation conditions to Jenny in the reference of PBDM means that John has given Jenny delegation approval. Jenny, upon receiving the conditions, must determine the authority vested to her by John as she is now delegated access authority.

Regarding the arguments to claims 3 and 4:

Examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments that PBDM is not directly related to and does not disclose the technical features of claims 3 and 4. Examiner upholds that the creation of a temporary role is not permanent based on some limiting factor and therefore a time restriction is in place.

Regarding the arguments to claims 5 and 6:

Examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments for claims 5 and 6. Examiner upholds that a delegation condition change\_schedule and role PE is considered a group

condition, therefore, claim 6 is disclosed by PBDM as a result of the "or" condition in the claim.

Regarding the arguments to claim 8:

Examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments for claim 8. Examiner upholds the rejection of claim 8, see rejection following the response.

Regarding all of the arguments:

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1 and 3-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by PBDM:

A Flexible Delegation Model in RBAC (hereinafter PBDM).

Regarding claim 1:

PBDM discloses a delegation method, implemented in a delegation system, comprising the steps of:

providing delegation policies as general rules for limiting delegation (Abstract, security administrator specify the permissions that a user (delgator) has authority to delegate to others (delegate));

receiving a delegation condition and a delegation approval submitted by a grantor for vesting authority of the grantor's role to a grantee, wherein the grantor's role is designated the authority to access a set of data (page 149, three types of situations in which delegation takes place (the third type specifies access authority in order to share information; page 152, 2<sup>nd</sup> column, when John wants to delegate, Jenny receives delegation conditions (group and temporary (time-based))); and

determining consequent authority vested to the grantee based on the delegation approval, the delegation condition and the delegation policies (page 152, 2<sup>nd</sup> column, Jenny has access to change\_schedule and role PE).

Regarding claims 3 and 4:

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the delegation condition comprises a static condition for limiting the vested authority, the static condition comprising at least a total time condition, a time condition, a location condition or a function condition (page 152, a temporary role is created by John (temporary is defined as not permanent, therefore a time condition is in place)).

Regarding claims 5 and 6:

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the delegation condition comprises a dynamic condition for limiting the vested authority, the dynamic condition comprising at

least a session condition or a group condition (page 152, John assigns Jenny to D2 with group condition change\_schedule and role PE).

Regarding claim 7:

The method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

storing the vested consequent authority as consequent delegation information (it is inherent that the vested consequent authority be stored);

creating a temporary role according to the consequent delegation information using a role-based system (page 152, steps P1 and P2 create a temporary role); and

designating the temporary role to the grantee (page 153, step P3 discloses assigning the role).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PBDM as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of RBAC Policies In XML For X.509 Based Privelege Management (hereinafter RBAC).

Regarding claim 2:

PBDM discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, but does not discloses wherein the delegation condition is presented in extensible markup language (XML).

RBAC discloses using XML to present the delegation condition (pages 13 and 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of PBDM with the method for using XML of RBAC in order to facilitate the sharing of data across different information systems.

Regarding claim 8:

PBDM and RBAC disclose the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the determining step further comprises the steps of:

determining whether the delegation condition satisfies the delegation policies (RBAC, page 12, The IF clause specifies conditions which must be satisfied in order for the actions to be granted);

adjusting the delegation condition to the delegation policies when the delegation condition does not satisfy the delegation policies (RBAC, page 12, the policy implicitly operates the Deny All Unless Explicitly Granted rule, thus if the condition is not met it will be changed to a deny all); and

acquiring a consequent delegation condition, where the consequent delegation condition comprises, when the delegation condition does not satisfy the delegation policies, the adjusted delegation condition or, when the delegation condition satisfies the delegation policies, comprises the delegation condition (RBAC, when the delegation condition is met, the current delegation is kept, but when the delegation condition is not met, the consequent delegation condition and policy is set to deny the access).

Regarding claim 9:

The method as claimed in claim 8, further comprising the steps of:

determining whether usage of the set of data satisfies the consequent delegation condition (RBAC, the delegation condition will be inherently checked each and every access); and

retracting the vested authority when usage of the set of data does not satisfy the consequent delegation condition (PBDM, it is inherent that the temporary role will be revoked after the time condition or the grantor removes the permission).

Claims 10-15 correspond to the system of claims 1-9 and claims 15-20 correspond to the machine-readable storage medium of claims 1-9 and are hereby rejected with the same logic as the rejection of claims 1-9.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within



TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Turchen whose telephone number is 571-270-1378. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWRF 7:30-5:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571)272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:  
10/804,415  
Art Unit: 2139

Page 9

JRT

  
**AYAZ SHEIKH**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**